

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 16, 17 and 22-25 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 15 and 21 have been canceled by this amendment, and claims 22-25 have been added.

### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-4, 6, 7, 12-14, 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment, Applicants note that claims 2 and 6 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of base claims 1 and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 6 are in condition for allowance. Claims 3, 4 and 12-14 depend from allowable claim 2, and claims 7, 16 and 17 depend from allowable claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 7, 12-14, 16 and 17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Also, for the Examiner's reference, it is noted that the term "operable" has been replaced with --configured-- throughout the claims.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 10 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. (US 5,568,274) in view of Hashimoto et al. (JP 05-110575); and claims 5 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. in

view of Hashimoto et al., and further in view of Toyohara (US 5,768,265).

As noted above, claims 1, 5, 10, 15 and 21 have been canceled by this amendment.

Regarding new claim 22, Applicants note that this claim substantially corresponds to rewritten claim 6, with minor changes made thereto. For example, Applicants note that the feature recited in claim 5 which indicates that “said data formatter is configured to insert the reproduction information together with information indicating effectiveness of the reproduction information, in a predetermined position in the coded video data” has not been included in claim 22. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the combination of features recited in new claim 22.

For example, Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami and Hashimoto do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the feature recited in claim 22 which indicates that said header analyzer includes a header analysis unit configured to analyze the header of the packet to output the reproduction information, and a reproduction information hold unit configured to hold the reproduction information.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 22 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 23-25 correspond to claims 7, 16 and 17, respectively, and are considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 22.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

*The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0975.*

Respectfully submitted,

Ryoji YAMAGUCHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By: 2010.05.04 23:35:12 -04'00'

---

Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 4, 2010